



Planning/Zoning
Special Meeting
Thursday, March 23, 2006
7:00 PM

The Trinity Planning Board held a Special Meeting on Thursday, March 23, 2006 at Trinity City Hall for the purpose of discussion and or action for the items listed on the Agenda.

Members Present: Chairman Robbie Sikes, Planning Members J.R. Ewings, Linda Gantt, Vernel Gibson, Buddy Maness, Scott Norman, Melvin Patterson

Members Absent: None

Others Present: City Manager, Ann Bailie; City Planner, Adam Stumb; and City Clerk/Finance Officer Debbie Hinson.

Item 1. Call to Order

Chairman Sikes called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm. An invocation was given by Planning Member Gibson.

Item 2. Ordinance Amendments

After Chairman Sikes opened this item, Mr. Stumb advised members that this meeting was called for discussion purposes since the Board would have 5 requests at their Regular Meeting on Tuesday. All the items listed under this item will have some sort of bearing on this request.

A. Residential Mixed Zoning District

Mr. Stumb advised members this was a part of a rezoning request by Gary Loflin from RA and R40 to RM (Mixed Residential). As a part of this request he is asking that the city change the density for single family units in the RM district from ½ acre or 20,000 square feet per lot to 12,000 square feet per lot which would be a density of 3.6 units per acre. Under the R-12 zoning district lots are allowed to be 12,000 sq feet however the overall density of a development can not exceed 3 units per acre.

There was discussion concerning the current stipulation of 3 houses per acre as a maximum, verses the 3.6 units that this new zoning would allow. Mr. Stumb advised members this change would affect Single Family Use. The density for Multi-Family Units is 12,000 square feet for the first 2 units and then 3,000 square feet for every unit after that. This equals approximately 15 to 16 units per acre.

There was discussion concerning whether this request involved apartments as well as Single Family. Manager Bailie advised members that the RM District allowed both so members may want to think about the affects this would have on both uses for the overall picture. If this change is approved it will apply to anyone who wants to rezone their property to RM. This change will affect anything in Trinity. This meeting is not to consider the actual rezoning, but to concentrate on the zoning change to RM Zoning District

Mr. Stumb advised members this type of zoning would give the developer some flexibility to lay out their project and to move things around until the Special Use part of the process. At that point everything will have to be complete and ready to submit for approval.

There was further discussion between members and Mr. Stumb concerning the R-12 zoning and the number of units allowed. Mr. Stumb advised members the developers request was to allow 12,000 Square Feet. This would equate to the 3.6 units. Chairman Sikes discussed the meaning of R-12 (12,000 square foot lots) or 3.6 units per acre and asked about the possibility of making this an R-14 Zoning District that would address this situation. Member Stumb advise Chairman Sikes and members that R-12 would allow a developer to do a 12,000 square foot lot but the overall density could not exceed 3 units per acre. There was discussion between members concerning how the lay of the property would dictate the number of homes that could be built on 1 acre and how 3 units would probably not be feasible for development for all of the property in question. If this change is approved it would allow approximately 60 more houses in a 100 acre development.

Manager Bailie discussed with Mr. Stumb calculations would be made if there were no stipulation on how the property would be divided between Multi-Family and Single Family homes. How would this be calculated if there was a limit of 3 per acre restriction? Mr. Stumb advised Manager Bailie and members that the way the subdivision was laid out would dictate how calculations were made. It is easy to calculate if the single family homes are separated from Multi-Family. There was further discussion between members and Mr. Stumb concerning how other city's addressed RM and what they used to address some of these questions. Mr. Stumb advised members the key question that members could answer was the density appropriate. We can look at other municipalities to find a method of calculations that would work for Trinity.

There was considerable discussion between members and the need to define how the split would be handled as well as how the board wanted to develop this into a workable change for Trinity and its residents. Members also discussed the current development status of Trinity and the lack of housing and how this affected growth. Without homes development such as restaurants will not come. We need to consider all of these things when making our decision and how the City of Trinity wants to grow.

After further discussion Manager Bailie summarized the topic and came up with the following 3 questions from member's discussion for their consideration.

1. To consider changing the 20,000 square foot minimum to a 12,000 square foot minimum.
2. To limit development to 3 per acre as currently allowed in the R-12 Zoning District.
3. To address concerns over the percentage of multi-family verses single family in the RM District.

Mr. Stumb advised members that no decision was needed for this item tonight but that staff would like to have some guidance in this area prior to Tuesday Night.

After further discussion concerning how to address the summary questions above ***it was the consensus of the Planning/Zoning Board members to allow 3 units per acre for Single Family Development in the RM District and for Mr. Stumb to make a recommendation to board concerning cap limits for Multi-Family in this district as discussed.***

After consensus was reached, Mr. Stumb discussed Open Space Allocation in developments inside the City. What was approved with R-12 is 1/60 acre per unit. The requirement for the RM Zoning District in general is 1/135 acre per unit regardless of the use. Now that we are looking at possibly changing the RM Districts to be very similar to our current R-12 Zoning District the question arises if we want to change the Open Space requirement for the RM Zoning to 1/60 acre per unit. This district will be similar or higher density (multi-family) than R-12. Under current standards for RM 2.6 acres of Open Space would be required for 100 acres whereas if this were changed to match the requirement in R-12 4.9 acres would be required for 100 acres. This is the space that can be used for common areas, tennis courts, swimming pool, walking trail throughout the neighborhood. I believe that if designed properly some of the stormwater ponds could be used as open or recreational space. The other option is to opt out and pay fee in lieu.

After discussion concerning the changes and the request that the math be checked , **it was the consensus of the Planning/Zoning Members to change the Open Space requirements in RM from 1/135 acre per unit to coincide with the R-12 Open Space Requirements of 1/60 acre per unit.**

B. Watershed Ordinance

Mr. Stumb advised members the current standards for Residential development could not exceed a 24% built upon area. If development goes above 3 units per acre you are very close to exceeding the 24%. There are options that allow the City to extend to a 50% Built Upon Area (BUA). We can't exceed the 50% according to our Watershed Regulations.

Option 1: is least restrictive option and could be available to all development. It would allow high density option use anywhere.

Option 2: It can be restricted to only Commercial and Industrial Use.

Option 3: The City could choose to restrict this even more and just base it on industrial development, commercial development, or mixed use development.

This is different from the 70% allocation and we will still maintain that amount. That means for 10% of the entire city we can allocate up to the 70% Built Upon Area.

This could be anywhere in the city and exceed our 10% allocation. This is a separate tool. Stormwater Ponds will be the big requirement that comes along with the high density option. They will have to control everything that washes from the development. The City will inspect the ponds but they must be maintained by the Homeowners Association. Anything that is built will have to be guaranteed during the construction process. Financial guarantees will also be required from the Homeowners Association or the developer by money or bonds that insure repairs can be made if the pond is damaged during a storm.

After further review of the options, ***Member Norman made a motion to accept Option 1- to make available to all uses, seconded by member Gibson and approved unanimously by all Planning Members present.***

C. Sidewalks

Manager Bailie advised members that Council discussed development at their Pre-Agenda meeting and are interested in quality development and the type of development they would like to see. There was discussion among members concerning the recommendation sent to Council previously concerning sidewalks. Council member Bridges discussed with members the reason this item was discussed again. When high density development takes place there is nowhere to walk but in the streets.

Members discussed sidewalks and how it helped control erosion as well as improve aesthetic appearance. Sidewalks provide better protection for the citizens and helps cut down on the cost for maintenance of the city streets. If sidewalks are not installed the City will incur more expense.

After further discussion concerning where this board would like to have sidewalks, ***Member Gibson made a motion to approve two sides for residential streets and cul-de-sacs, seconded by Member Patterson and approved unanimously by all members present.***

After a brief discussion concerning the need for sidewalks for business development, ***Planning Member Gant made a motion to require sidewalks for business development as well, seconded by Council member Patterson and approved unanimously by all members present.***

D. Helipad

Mr. Stumb advised members that Guil-Rand Fire Department originally intended to install an emergency Helipad. This would not be heavily used and would be used as an emergency area to pickup patients for transport. Guil-Rand will need a Special Use Permit to build this pad.

Member Patterson discussed perceived problems from his experience of flying and landing helicopters.

Mr. Stumb advised members that Guil-Rand had originally shown this on their Special Use Permit but has since removed it. This item is subject to review and discussion if requested at a later date.

3. Neighborhood Overlay District

Mr. Stumb advised members this could be used to address modular homes in current subdivision developments that have vacant lots. As sewer becomes available then these lots are being developed. This could allow neighbors to come to the City for assistance to address the standard issues. There was discussion regarding the differences in modular and mobile homes. Modular Homes must be built to the same codes as stick homes whereas mobile homes are built according to standards set by the state.

Manger Bailie and Mr. Stumb discussed how this district could be applied. A percentage of current property owners could be set that would be needed to petition the city to apply for the Neighborhood Overlay. After the Overlay was applied the City would be able to enforce the standards set in the Overlay District.

4. Traditional Neighborhood Development

Manager Bailie advised members a trip was planned for April 5, 2006 to look at other types of development used in different municipalities. She advised members that there would be a chance to meet and talk with developers and city officials that helped with some of these developments. Manager Bailie advised members that she hoped all would come. This can give us some ideas of what type of development is available and what we may want to do to update or Ordinances.

5. Comments from the Board

None

6. Comments from the Staff

Comments between Staff and members concerning the items listed on the Tuesday Agenda and how the fire departments would be discussed. Member Maness will recuse himself from the Fair Grove discussion because he is on their Board.

7. Adjourn

With no other business to discuss, *the March 23, 2006 Special Meeting was adjourned at 8:49 pm upon motion by Member Ewings, seconded by member Patterson and approved unanimously by all members present.*

These minutes were approved as written by the Planning/Zoning Board at their April 25, 2006 Regular Meeting upon motion by Member Maness, seconded by Member Ewings, and approved unanimously by all Planning Members present.

Debbie Hinson, City Clerk

Robbie Sikes, P/Z Chairman

Date

Date